

From: [Mark Baker](#)
To: [Toni Hawkins](#)
Cc: [Grube-Lybarker, Carri](#); [Hall, Roger](#); [Rhaney, Donna L](#); [PSC LegalFilings](#); [Moser, Sandra](#); [Samuel Wellborn](#); [Katie Brown](#); [Lisle Traywick](#); [Jacqueline Wilson](#); [Walton, Kimberly](#); [Satterfield, Kristen](#); [Piersall, Lyndsay McNeely](#)
Subject: [External] Re: FILED: Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss the Complaint (Baker v. DEP - DN 2022-155-E)
Date: Tuesday, May 31, 2022 8:27:59 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear South Carolina Public Service Commission,

I feel that I must apologize for the behavior of Duke Energy Progress and their efforts to waste the Commission's time with their unfaithful effort to answer this one basic question: *"Is the quality of their LED streetlights the same or better quality than the quality of the previous HPS lights they replaced?"* Why not just submit the hundreds of studies that Duke Energy Progress relied on to ensure that LED streetlights are safe for the public? The answer, of course, is that the hundreds of studies show that LED light is toxic, dangerous, and discriminatory. But rather than simply getting to work and getting the problem fixed, DEP wants to take their \$25 Billion revenue from 2021 and pay their attorneys to see if they can avoid having to protect the health and safety of South Carolina residents.

DEP misrepresents the situation. I am not an attorney and I don't practice law. I do not represent anybody and I resent DEP's efforts to cast me as a lawyer. I am simply someone who has expertise in the area of LED light toxicity and am doing whatever I can to assist a resident of South Carolina have the DEP remove the LED streetlights that are making the resident sick. The Commission should know that National Grid already reverted 5 LED streetlights in New York back to HPS because the LED streetlights were making the residents sick. So it's not as if this has never been done before or that nobody has ever gotten sick from LED before.

It is true that we are based in Oregon and that I don't personally live in South Carolina, but that is irrelevant. I asked DEP to answer the question, and they refused. I asked the SCORS for help, and they declined (which of course is extremely bothersome in itself that an organization that supposedly is there to support consumers won't do anything to help consumers). The SCPSC website states *"the Public Service Commission took on an exclusively quasi-judicial role"* DEP is acting like we are in Superior or Federal Court. We are not. The Mission of the SCPSC is to "Serve the Public", not to serve DEP. The SCPSC's favoritism must be skewed towards the individual consumer who does not have hundreds of lawyers on their payroll and who does not make \$25 Billion per year in revenue.

DEP has brought this situation onto themselves by not acting in good faith and not answering the question. Now, DEP is desperately attempting to convince the Commission that nobody needs to know anything about this low quality light that they have installed. DEP doesn't think anybody needs to know that DEP had a 5% increase in profits in 2021 over 2020, but sickened the residents of South Carolina in the process.

The SCPSC states explicitly on their website that Pro Se is perfectly valid:

REPRESENTING YOURSELF

In all matters before the Commission, you have the opportunity to represent yourself or to retain the services of a lawyer. For more information, please download and review the Pro Se Litigant Guide [at this link](https://psc.sc.gov/consumer-info/file-complaint). (<https://psc.sc.gov/consumer-info/file-complaint>)

The attempt by DEP to disallow Pro Se must be ignored and I should be given an opportunity to explain to the Commission how LED streetlights are a low-quality light that is harming the health and welfare of South Carolina residents.

Sincerely,

Mark Baker
President
Soft Lights Foundation
www.softlights.org
mbaker@softlights.org

On Tue, May 31, 2022 at 1:59 PM Toni Hawkins <thawkins@robinsongray.com> wrote:

Attached please find a copy of Duke Energy Progress, LLC's Reply in Support of Motion to Dismiss the Complaint which has been filed with the SCPSC in Docket No. 2022-155-E (*Mark Baker, Complainant/Petitioner v. Duke Energy Progress, LLC, Defendant/Respondent*).

Thank you.

Toni Hawkins



TONI HAWKINS PARALEGAL

DIRECT 803.227.1122

1310 Gadsden Street
PO Box 11449 (29211)
Columbia, SC 29201

VCARD
ROBINSONGRAY.COM



NOTICE: This e-mail is confidential and may contain information which is legally privileged or otherwise exempt from disclosure. If you received this message in error, please delete this message from your device.

[Supporting Green](#) print wisely.
